Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of

MOBILE RELAY ASSOCIATES	)	WT Docket No. 13-212
	)	
To Operate on Frequency Pairs 462/467.5375 MHz and 462/467.7375 MHz at Multiple Locations in the Los Angeles, Denver, Las Vegas, and Miami Metropolitan Areas	)	Public Notice, DA 13-1838

To: Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY COMMENTS FROM MOBILE RELAY ASSOCIATES

Mobile Relay Associates ("MRA"), by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 1.45 of the Commission's rules, hereby submits these Supplemental Reply Comments ("Supplement") in the captioned proceeding. This Supplement responds only to new material put into the record in the "Reply Comments" filed on October 31, 2013 by the Personal Radio Steering Group ("PRSG", such filing, the "PRSG Comments"). Although styled "Reply Comments", in fact the PRSG Comments were directed solely at the original MRA Waiver Request, and not at any of the various comments herein that were filed on September 30, 2013. Accordingly, MRA has the right to file this Supplement, as MRA's Reply Comments filed on October 31, 2013 ("MRA Reply") could not possibly have anticipated or responded to the PRSG Comments.[1]

SUMMARY OF PRSG COMMENTS

PRSG begins with a history of the General Mobile Radio Service ("GMRS") service since 1948, and includes a section on the origins of the Family Radio Service ("FRS") as well.

[1] The Commission afforded PRSG an extension of time to file comments upon the MRA Waiver Request. MRA does not dispute PRSG's right to have filed its comments when it did. Rather, MRA clarifies that PRSG addressed the Waiver Request, not other parties' comments.

PRSG makes specific reference to a 1985 rulemaking in the GMRS service (PRSG Comments, p.2), and says that as a result of that rulemaking, GMRS in the 460 MHz band is now restricted to only 5 watts transmitter power and repeaters are prohibited. *Id*. (As discussed below, PRSG is mistaken; GMRS is permitted to operate repeaters and to operate at 50 watts transmitter power except when GMRS operators are using FRS channels instead of GMRS channels.) Then PRSG gets to the heart of its argument, which is as follows, *id*.:

> Likewise, nowhere in its Request for Waiver did MRA acknowledge the prior FCC determination that it was in the public interest that the GMRS interstitial frequencies should be considerably restricted in transmitter output power (especially in the GMRS 467 MHz band), or that non-detachable, integral transmit antennas should now be required in the FRS. And nowhere in its Request for Waiver did MRA argue that for its anticipated use, would these power and antenna-connectivity restrictions/requirements prevent it from achieving its desired operational objectives.

RESPONSE TO PRSG COMMENTS

I. GMRS Operates the Same as Analog Part 90 T-Band Licensees

Contrary to PRSG's allegation, MRA did account for the particularities of GMRS operations. GMRS, which, as PRSG notes, is exempted from later changes that occurred in Part 90, operates the same as do incumbent wideband analog Part 90 licensees in the 470-512 MHz band (the "T-Band"), which Part 90 licensees are also exempted from having to make those changes, and which continue to operate analog FM equipment with a 20 kHz emission designator at the same power levels as in GMRS. Contrary to the PRSG Comments, GMRS is authorized to operate repeater stations as well as mobile stations, and is authorized to operate with 50 watts transmitter power with either the mobile or repeater. Mobiles typically operate with either 0db gain (50W ERP), 3db gain (100W ERP) or 5db gain (160W ERP) antennas. Control stations typically operate with 10db gain (500W ERP) antennas. Repeaters typically operate with any

amount of antenna (up to 10db, but not limited to 10db) resulting in roughly 500 watts ERP if a 10db gain antenna is utilized from mountaintop sites if desired. There is no material difference between GMRS and the analog wideband operations of Public Safety licensees named in the MRA Reply, p.4.

II. MRA's Proposed Channels Are Not Interstitial, Nor Do They Overlap GMRS

Contrary to PRSG's allegation, and unlike FRS, MRA's proposed channels are not interstitial to GMRS, nor (unlike FRS) do MRA's channels overlap with GMRS. The FRS allocations referenced by PRSG are in between GMRS frequencies. However, MRA is proposing to be adjacent to the last GMRS channel, such that GMRS is only on one side of MRA, not both.

More importantly, the involved FRS channels are 11 kHz wide emission designator channels, in between 20 kHz wide GMRS channels.[2] Thus, the FRS channels in fact spectrally overlap the GMRS channels, and where there is such spectral overlap, then indeed there must be severe power and other restrictions to avoid harmful interference.[3] In sharp contrast, the MRA channels would be only 4 kHz wide, not 11 kHz wide, so there is zero spectral overlap between MRA and GMRS.[4]

---

[2] The involved FRS channels are "authorized" for 12.5 kHz, but the relevant consideration is the "occupied" bandwidth, which is a function of the emission designator. The same applies to the GMRS channels, which are 25 kHz "authorized" but 20 kHz "occupied."

[3] The FRS radios are limited to 0.5W ERP with an integral antenna (to avoid having people adding high gain antennas to the radios), specifically because there is frequency overlap between FRS and the existing GMRS spectrum. GMRS *licensed* operators are allowed to operate up to 5.0W ERP on the FRS channels.

[4] Because GMRS is equally high power as Part 90 I/B, with no spectral overlap, there is no need for any additional protection (above and beyond preservation of the spectral separation, which MRA's proposal does).

III. Four Years' Experience Proves There Is No Harmful Interference

PRSG claims (PRSG Comments, p.3) that because GMRS licensees often use older, analog FM equipment with less efficient filtering capability, GMRS operators will suffer interference from MRA even if there were no spectral overlap. However, in the T-Band, Part 90 licensees have been free to continue operating analog FM wideband using their old equipment, and in order to save taxpayer money, many local government licensees in major metro areas (including Los Angeles) have done so. The equipment of these local government licensees, licensed as Public Safety, are just as susceptible to harmful interference as are GMRS licensees. Yet, since the LMCC and the Commission allowed the introduction of the same 4 kHz narrowband operations that MRA proposes here, those incumbent analog wideband Public Safety licensees have co-existed with the new digital narrowband licensees without harmful interference being received on either side.

Again, MRA references the examples set forth in the MRA Reply, p.4. And as noted therein, those are only *examples* of adjacent non-overlapping operation without interference (due to aged filtering equipment or otherwise); there are hundreds of such instances of co-existence nationwide.

PRSG argues that retention of a guardband between GMRS and Part 90 is needed. PRSG Comments, p.2. But, as shown in MRA's charts, there remains such a guardband between MRA's proposed Part 90 operations and GMRS, so PRSG's argument is a *non sequitur*.

PRSG mischaracterizes MRA as complaining about interference received on existing channels in Pat 90 in these four specific metro areas (Los Angeles, Miami, Las Vegas and Denver). PRSG Comments, p.3. However, MRA's primary problem, as MRA stressed, is the overwhelming *congestion* due to the growth in Part 90 users in these specific markets. While

overwhelming congestion does spawn harmful interference, the only way to ameliorate congestion, other than narrowbanding (which has already occurred), is to find additional fallow spectrum (which is exactly what MRA did).

CONCLUSION

There will be no harm whatsoever to GMRS from the MRA proposal. Accordingly, the Commission should expeditiously grant the MRA Waiver Request and the associated applications.

Respectfully submitted,
MOBILE RELAY ASSOCIATES

November 4, 2013

By: _____/s/_____
David J. Kaufman, Its Attorney

Rini O'Neil, PC
1200 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

202-955-5516
dkaufman@rinioneil.com